

REMARKS

This paper responds to the Office Action mailed on August 30, 2005.

Claims 19, 20, 80, 83, 98, 104-107, 109, 119 and 121 are amended. Claims 53, 79, 82, 85-87, 111, 112, and 125 are canceled without disclaimer or prejudice. As a result, claims 19, 20, 80, 81, 83, 84, 98-102, 104-110, 113-114 and 115-124 are now pending in this application.

Claims 107 and 109 are amended only to rewrite claims 107 and 109 in independent form as suggested by the Office Action.

§112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 53, 85, 87 and 111-112 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description. The Office Action indicates that claims 53, 85, 87 and 111-112 contain subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant submits that claims 53, 85, 87 and 111-112 contain subject matter which was described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time of the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant cancels claims 53, 85, 87 and 111-112 without disclaimer or prejudice. Applicant may reintroduce claims 53, 85, 87 and 111-112 in another patent application.

Claim 125 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Applicant respectfully traverses. Applicant submits that claim 125 particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant cancels claim 125 without disclaimer or prejudice. Applicant may reintroduce claim 125 in another patent application.

§102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 19, 79, 81, 108 and 125 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) for anticipation by Suguro et al. (U.S. 5,189,503).

Independent claim 19 is amended to include at least some of the things at least similar to the things recited in the allowable claim 107. Thus, Applicant believes that claim 19 is also allowable. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 19 and dependent claims 79, 81, and 108.

Regarding claim 125, Applicant does not admit that Suguro et al. is prior art with respect to claim 125. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant cancels claim 125 without disclaimer or prejudice. As stated above, Applicant may reintroduce claim 125 in another patent application.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 20, 82, 84 and 110 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Blodgett et al. (U.S. 5,811,990) in view of Suguro et al.

Independent claim 20 is amended to include the things at least similar to the things recited in the allowable claim 109. Thus, Applicant believes that claim 20 is also allowable. Accordingly, Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection, and allowance of claim 20 and dependent claims 82, 84, and 110.

Claims 53, 85, 87 and 112 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Suguro et al. in view of Radosevich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,576,240).

Applicant does not admit that Suguro et al. and Radosevich et al. are prior art with respect to claims 53, 85, 87 and 112. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant cancels claims 53, 85, 87 and 112 without disclaimer or prejudice. As stated above, Applicant may reintroduce claims 53, 85, 87 and 112 in another patent application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 107 and 109 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

As indicated above, claims 107 and 109 are amended only to rewrite claims 107 and 109 in independent form as suggested by the Office Action. The rewriting of claims 107 and 109 does not alter the scope of claims 107 and 109. Thus, claims 107 and 109 are now in condition for allowance.

Withdrawn Claims

As stated in the previous amendment and responses, Applicant believed that at least claim 19 is a generic/linking claim for all species. In the previous amendment and responses, Applicant also requested consideration and allowance of the withdrawn claims when claim 19 is allowed. Since claim 19 is now believed to be allowable, Applicant again requests consideration and allowance of the withdrawn claims when claim 19 is allowed.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance, and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6969 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.


Respectfully submitted,

KARL M. ROBINSON

By his Representatives,


SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6969

Date 30 November 2005

By 
Viet V. Tong
Reg. No. 45,416

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 30 day of November, 2005.

KATE CANNON
Name


Signature